

REMARKS

Claims 15-16, 27-35, and 40-51 are pending. Claims 15, 16, and 27 are amended herein.

The Examiner rejected each of the claims in accordance with the following table. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections below.

Statutory Section	Claim(s)	Reference(s)
35 U.S.C. § 102(e)	15-16, 27-31, 45, and 48	Bieganski (6,412,012)
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	32-34	Bieganski and Cluts (5,616,876)
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	40-42, 46-47, and 49	Bieganski and Chow (6,850,899)
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	43 and 50	Bieganski, Chow, and Cluts
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	35 and 51	Bieganski and Nakajima (5,897,650)
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	44	Bieganski, Chow, and Nakajima

Bieganski describes a system for ensuring that recommended items are compatible with a second set of items, such as a set of items in a shopping cart. Bieganski starts with a recommendation set (see Fig. 2), and filters the recommendation set based on a shopping set, a history set, and item compatibility rules to produce a compatibility-modified recommendation set. Bieganski describes performing this filtering using substitute items and complement items. Tofu and bacon are examples of substitute items because purchasers of one typically do not purchase the other. Eggs and cake mix are examples of complement items, because purchasers of cake mix typically also buy eggs. Items in the recommendation set that are substitutes for items in the shopping set may be weighted lower than other items in the recommendation set and in some cases removed from the recommendation set, whereas items in the recommendation set that are complements of items in the shopping set may be weighted higher.

In contrast, applicant's disclosure describes an item recommendation system in which a user selects multiple seed items and receives a list of recommended items each generated based on the multiple selected seed items. As recited in the claims, applicant's disclosure allows a user to assemble a group of seed items that represents the type of items that the user is trying to find, such that each of the recommended items is automatically selected based on the entire set of seeds. Each of applicant's

claims recites producing recommended items each based on multiple seed items selected by a user. Claims 15 and 16 recite "generating a list of recommended items each based on the selected seed items." Claim 27 recites "the list of recommendation seeds can be used to generate a list of recommended items each based on the recommendation seeds that are selected." Bieganski does not describe producing recommended items each based on multiple seed items. There are two areas of Bieganski that the Examiner suggests are similar to the multiple seeds recited by applicant, each discussed below.

First, the Examiner suggests that the recommendation set itself is produced using multiple seeds. However, the background of Bieganski treats producing recommendation sets as prior art and does not provide enabling details about how the recommendation set is created, and in particular, how any seed items are used. Bieganski assumes that the recommendation set is already available and created by another system, "[t]he present invention is applicable to recommendation sets generated in all manners, including those recommendation sets generated by recommendation engines." Bieganski, col.6:9-12.

Second, the Examiner suggests that the secondary sets of information (e.g., a shopping set of a current purchase or a history set of past purchases) used by Bieganski to filter out incompatible recommendation items constitute multiple seed items used to produce recommendations. However, Bieganski generally uses items in the secondary set to exclude items already in the recommendation set from being displayed to the user, "[a] compatibility-modified recommendation set may exclude items [from the original recommendation set] that would be recommended without compatibility information." Bieganski, col. 6:17-19. In these circumstances, Bieganski does not use these secondary sets of items to find additional items to recommend to the user. Therefore, these secondary sets of items are not seed items. When Bieganski does add additional items to the compatibility-modified recommendation set, it does so only to add items that were not found by any previous process used to create the recommendation set, "[a] compatibility-modified recommendation set...may recommend items that would not have been recommended without compatibility information."

Bieganski, col. 6:19-21. These additional items are based on one or more recommended complements that are each associated with only a single item (e.g., eggs are associated with cake mix) as described above. Therefore, these types of recommendations involve recommending one or more items based on at most a single seed.

Neither of the above-described portions of Bieganski describes producing recommended items each based on multiple seed items. Moreover, none of the other references identified in the Examiner's rejection disclose or suggest generating item recommendations based on multiple user-selected seeds. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

In addition, claim 35 recites "the control displayed for a distinguished product group is a draggable portion of the information describing the product group, together with a destination region." Claims 44 and 51 recite similar language. Nakajima, cited by the Examiner for teaching draggable controls, describes a document scrap system in which a user selects a portion of a document to create a document scrap for incorporation into other documents. It is unclear how it would be possible to combine the system of Nakajima with Bieganski to produce the aspects of applicant's technology described by this claim. Bieganski does not describe dragging at all, and Nakajima only describes dragging portions of documents to the desktop for later reuse in other documents. The control recited by Applicant's claims is for selecting recommendation seeds. There is no teaching or suggestion within either Bieganski or Nakajima to combine these references in any way, much less to produce Applicant's invention. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

Based upon these remarks and amendments, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-3265. Applicant believes all required fees are being paid in connection with this response.

However, if an additional fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 249768045US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated:

6/12/2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

J. Mason Boswell

Registration No.: 58,388

PERKINS COIE LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-3265

(206) 359-4265 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant